

REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 8-10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 in view of Japanese Patent Reference No. 6-51386 (“Yoshida”). As previously provided, independent claim 8 has been amended to recite, in part, another lens located between the base portion and the tubular portion when another lens is mounted on the front side of the optical system. This is supported in the specification, for example, in Figure 3 and the corresponding text in the written description. Nowhere does Yoshida disclose or suggest such feature as shown, for example, in Figure 1 of this reference. Based on at least these reasons, Applicants believe that the Yoshida reference is distinguishable from independent claim 8 and dependent claims thereof. Moreover, the Patent Office has indicated that the subject matter as further defined in claims 11 and 13-14 would be allowable if not based on an alleged, rejected base claim. Therefore, Applicants believe that the anticipation rejection should be withdrawn.

The Patent Office has also objected to the specification, specifically the summary of invention section. For example, the Patent Office alleges that this section is too long, and further improperly contains a reference to a comparison of the prior art.

Applicants respectfully submit that the summary of invention section does indeed comply with USPTO patent practice. In this regard, the summary does indicate the nature and substance of the invention pursuant to MPEP 608.01(d). Moreover, Applicants do not believe that the summary section is too long where indeed the MPEP does not provide any specific length in which this section should not exceed. The MPEP section merely states that the subject matter of the invention should be described in one or more clear, concise sentences or paragraphs. Applicants believe that the summary section as written thus generally complies with standard patent practice procedures in the USPTO. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this objection be withdrawn.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and earnestly solicit reconsideration of same.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account 02-1818 for any fees which are due and owing.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY 

Thomas C. Basso
Reg. No. 46,541
Cust. No. 29175

Dated: May 18, 2006